

FEB 4 2 59 PM '75

30 January 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Complaint Initiated [REDACTED] DC/EA/SS

25X1

1. [REDACTED] came by on 29 January 1975 to drop off a memorandum for me, although addressed to the Director of Equal Employment Opportunity. It had been routed by C/EA [REDACTED] through the Acting EA/EEO Representative, C/EA and the ADDO. Overhearing [REDACTED] talking with the secretary, I asked her in for a chat regarding the letter she had written to C/EA in late November 1974 and subsequently circulated among various senior officials in the DDO as well as the IG and DCI.

25X1

2. [REDACTED] concern in her letter of November and in the memorandum dated 25 January (in which she seeks to bring a discrimination complaint) centers on her inability, despite excellent evaluations of her work by her supervisors and two QSI's in the last two years, to get promoted from GS-07 to GS-08 in the slot she now fills (a GS-07 slot). She says that she likes working for the Agency, is happy in her job and likes the people she works for and with, but she is determined to express herself in ways available to her against the present system whereby secretarial slots are related to the grade of the supervisor and in which recognition by promotion is not possible despite the quantity and quality of work done in a particular slot. She has other concerns which she feels reflect a lack of status of the "clericals" (I invited her to suggest a better generic term for the lower grade-level employees, other than "non-professional") but we agreed that these were less basic than what she perceives as the conflict between merit and the job classification and promotion system.

3. Regarding EEO discrimination aspects of her case, I advised [REDACTED] that although I would want to read her written complaint before offering definitive thoughts on it, it did not strike me as coming under the EEO complaint category. I noted that EEO complaints must be based on a

E2 DUGET
CL BY 016109

CONFIDENTIAL

claim of discrimination because of sex, religion, race, color, national origin or age. I questioned that any of these were applicable to her complaint as I understood it. Rather, it seemed to me to be more along the lines of a work related grievance which I would wish to discuss with her and consider as the DDO Grievance Counselor. She acknowledged that that might well be the case. I did explain to her the EEO complaint process and timetable in some detail, indicating the necessity for taking an EEO complaint first to one of the EEO counselors for an effort at informal resolution through counseling before I or D/EEO could formally accept or reject it as an EEO discrimination case.

25X1 4. We then discussed at length her own situation and the clerical slotting and promotion picture. I told her that I had been struck by the large scope/requirements of her job as stated in her Letter of Instruction (admin assistant, office manager, secretary) and my first thought was to wonder if upgrading had been requested or attempted. I pointed out top management's awareness of the more general problem as reflected in the consideration last fall by the Agency Management Committee of the senior secretarial slotting situation. [redacted] remarked on the slowness of action and lack of visible results. I brought her up to date on the fact that work was continuing; a number of secretarial positions had been identified for reclassification examination by FMCD (based more on job content and less on supervisory grade level) and that the list had just been prepared for sending forward. She said that C/EA had told her that her slot was included for reexamination for possible upgrading. She looks forward to this, but is particularly concerned that she be given the chance to talk with the FMCD people involved in examining her job. According to [redacted] her slot had been previously surveyed for upgrading (unsuccessfully), but she had not been asked to tell the classifier what she actually was doing.

25X1 5. Further concerning job classification, I told [redacted] that the task of the classifiers is a valid one, namely to make sure that the USG does not pay more for work than is justified by either the duties of the job or the competitive situation within and without the government. I noted that this often did not coincide with the judgements or desires of supervisors, who usually value their secretaries, want to keep them happy (e. g., witness the two QSI's given her, the latest last fall) and want to hang on to quality people. I noted, however, that there had to be some outside controls on grade of slots and promotions. In answer to her comment that supervisors in general do not do enough to keep their people informed of efforts on their behalf (promotion recommendations made, what slots they are in, etc.), I pointed out that it usually came down to a judgement as to how much should be told and when -- too many supervisors have seen their efforts and recommendations not get very far for one reason or

25X1

another and are wary of premature revelations.

6. I suggested that her LOI seemed to be the basis for a good case for upgrading, but that PMCD had their own responsibilities and standards and it might not come about. She mentioned to me that EA had offered her a CS-03 slot a couple of times, but that she liked her present job and did not feel that the other offered as much challenge or responsibility. I noted the responsibility of the management in a component to watch the distribution of work and to seek reclassification downward as well as upward of slots that no longer bear the same workload as previously. We agreed that inasmuch as she wishes to avoid changing jobs when higher grade openings are offered her, she would obviously be faced with a decision should the upgrading of her present slot not prove possible:

- a. She could stay in the same job (provided her supervisors continued to want her) and work for the pay and grade allotted.
- b. She could seek to have her supervisor give her less work (i.e., reduce the tasks in the LOI).
- c. She could leave and seek more remunerative employment elsewhere, as the Agency, as with most organizations in the private or public areas, plans on the basis of a turnover of personnel, not least in the clerical ranks.

25X1 I thanked [] for talking with me and for expressing herself on her own and the more general situations as she sees them. I told her I would study her paper of 25 January and give her my views on it as an EEO complaint.

7. Conclusions and recommendations:

25X1 a. [] be advised that I have studied her memorandum of 25 January and that the complaint appears to me to be a work-related grievance rather than an EEO matter. However, should she feel that the complaint is based on sex, color, race, national origin, religion or age, she should begin the process in accordance with regulations by contacting one of our five EEO Counselors. (Action: Undersigned).

25X1 b. [] be advised that when and if her job is reexamined by PMCD (I am assuming she heard correctly that her slot was one identified by EA for survey), that her supervisor will see that she has an opportunity to talk with the classifier about her job and the duties

she performs. (Action: C/EA, if he agrees with this suggestion).

25X1

c. [] be advised that assuming she wishes to remain in her present slot, any further counseling or action on her complaint should await the result of the slot reclassification effort. (Action: Undersigned in coordination with C/EA).

25X1

d. [] be allowed to read this memorandum as representing my recollection of the major points discussed in our meeting and as notification of the above conclusions and recommendations. (Action: C/EA by routing the memo on []

25X1

/s/

25X1

DDO Equal Employment Opportunity
Officer and Grievance Counselor

Attachment:L

25X1

Copy of [] memorandum
dated 23 January 1975

75-0570

25 January 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Equal Employment Opportunity

STATINTL
STATINTL

SUBJECT : Discrimination against [redacted]
Office of Chief, East Asia [redacted]

1. I should like to file a complaint of discrimination against me because I am a "clerical." I cannot be promoted although I received two Outstanding Fitness Reports during the past two years. I do not believe that I am being recognized according to my merit. I am judged, not by my ability, but by the grade of my supervisor. The Office of Personnel has continued to grade Secretaries according to the grade of their boss. If you work for a GS-18, you are a GS-09; if you work for a GS-17, you are a GS-08; and, as in my case, you work for a GS-16, you are a GS-07. I have been in-grade for five years (since May 1969).

2. When the Office of Personnel/Position Management and Compensation Division (PMCD) surveyed East Asia Division approximately three years ago, I was instructed by the then Chief of Support to list my duties as I would be given the opportunity to discuss my responsibilities with a member of the survey team. After writing down my duties and responsibilities, keeping a weekly tab on the amount of paper flow into and out of the office, I was not given the opportunity to discuss it with the team. I was not even aware the survey was over until we received a copy of their report. Needless to say, my position was not upgraded. How could they know what I was doing without having talked to me? Even the Chief of Support did not know how much work I was backstopping and keeping off his desk, freeing him for more important duties. [redacted] Chief, East Asia [redacted] requested Chief, East Asia [redacted] to forward a copy of my LOI to OP/PMCD back in November 1974. To date, I am unaware of any action having been taken on it.

3. Here [redacted] I hold the top clerical "D" slot, a GS-07. Yet the Finance Assistants and the Personnel Assistants are brought into the Division as GS-07's usually. They have no slots lower than GS-07. The Personnel Assistants are usually GS-07, being promoted to GS-08 the following year, followed by their promotion to GS-09 the next year. They have six GS-09 slots plus two GS-07 slots. I have been told they, too, are clericals, but look at the grade of their slots!

I am attaching a copy of my recent Letter of Instructions. Does that job description sound like a GS-07? I work for the Chief of Support, the Deputy Chief, and a GS-12 Support Officer temporarily assigned to our staff until he goes overseas in April. I do all the mail pickup, distribution, secretarial work etc. and only occasionally asking the Secretary to Chief, EA, to help with some of the typing. In addition, I also help with the typing of the overflow [redacted] when they are snowed under or their girl is on leave. STATINTL

4. I respectfully submit that I am performing at the same level as the GS-09 Personnel Assistants and should be so graded. The grade of my supervisor should have no bearing on my grade. I should be judged solely by my abilities. See "Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies" from The White House dated September 20, 1974 (Attachment A).

5. I am also attaching a copy of "An Open Letter to C/EA" from me dated 27 November 1974 (Attachment B) which has attached to it a copy of my LOI. It will help to explain my feelings about being branded a "clerical." (I am still wearing my scarlet letter "C" and will continue to do so until some action is taken to remedy this situation.)

6. I was granted a QSI in August 1973 after having been denied a promotion in January 1973. Again, in October 1974, I was granted a QSI in lieu of a promotion. The following are the overall ratings given to me on my Fitness Reports since I came to the Support Staff from the Clerical Pool in April 1967:

Period	Rating (Overall)	
3 Jan 67 - 30 Sept 67	"S" from CEA/	I was assigned to both officers during this period
19 Apr 67 - 31 Oct 67	"O" from CEA/	
1 Nov 67 - 1 Jun 68	"O"	
Special (Promotion) Mar 69	"O" from CEA/	
	"O" from CEA/	
Jun 69 - Jun 70	"O"	
1 Jul 70 - 30 Jun 71	"O"	
1 Jul 71 - 30 Jun 72	"S" (individual ratings were three "O" and two "S")	
1 Jul 72 - 30 Jun 73	"O"	
1 Jul 73 - 30 Jun 74	"O"	

You can see from the above that although I have received Outstanding ratings throughout most of my years in the Support Staff, I have not

been promoted. I am sure many people in East Asia Division who did not receive such ratings were promoted. However, as a "clerical" I am discriminated against as they will not promote me regardless of my performance if my slot, too, is a GS-07. If I am performing at the Outstanding level, I should be promoted along with others receiving such, or even lower, ratings.

7. It is respectfully requested that appropriate action be taken to ensure that I am not discriminated against further and that I be accorded the same advancement given others according to their performance. STATINTL

[Redacted]
Office of
Chief, East Asia [Redacted]

STATINTL

Attachments:

- A - Memo from The White House
- B - An Open Letter to C/EA
w/atts (including LOI)